UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/162,825	09/29/98	BOE	B 065027.0103

LM02/1124

BAKER & BOTTS
2001 ROSS AVENUE
DALLAS TX 75201-2980

EXAMINER	
TESFAMARIAM, M	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2764	4

DATE MAILED: 11/24/99

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.	Applicant(s)
09/162,825	Barbara J. Boe, et al.
Examiner	**Group Art Unit**
Mussie Tesfamariam	2764

☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *Sep 29, 1998*

☐ This action is **FINAL.**

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire *3* month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claim

☒ Claim(s) *1-25* is/are pending in the applicat

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) *1-9, 11-19, and 21-23* is/are rejected.

☒ Claim(s) *10, 20, 24, and 25* is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☒ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____ .

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). *3*

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103© and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

2. Claims 1-6, 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanson et al, 5974398 in view of Powers, 5956691

As per claim 1, Hanson et al disclose in an on line interaction. See the abstract, fig 3, items 318, fig 4, fig 5. Hanson et al also disclose in providing a user with request. See fig 13, item 1110, col 3, lines 13-15. Hanson et al also disclose in customer profile database. See col 4, lines 14, 24-34. Hanson et al also disclose in providing the customer with options to adjust the customer's actual

demographic information. See fig 2, col 5, lines 63-67. However, Hanson et al fail to disclose in hypothetical feedback information, graphically illustrating the hypothetical standing of the customer within the selected peer group such that the customer can see the effect of the hypothetical demographic changes. Powers discloses in hypothetical feedback information, graphically illustrating the hypothetical standing of the customer within the selected peer group. See the abstract, fig 1, and fig 3. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to include hypothetical feedback information, graphically illustrating the hypothetical standing of the customer within the selected peer group such that the customer can see the effect of the hypothetical demographic changes because this would improve Hanson's system to have graph integrity.

As per claim 2, Hanson et al disclose in an on line interaction. See the abstract, fig 3, items 318, fig 4, fig 5. Hanson et al also disclose in providing a user with request. See fig 13, item 1110, col 3, lines 13-15. However, Hanson et al fail to disclose in a primary set of questions and a secondary set of questions. Official notice is taken that a primary set of questions and a secondary set of questions is old and well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to include a primary set of questions and a secondary set of questions because this would improve Hanson's system to provide the customers with survey.

As per claim 3, Hanson et al disclose in the customer's demographic includes personal information. See fig 2, col 5, lines 63-64.

As per claim 4, Hanson et al disclose in an on line interaction. See the abstract, fig 3, items 318, fig 4, fig 5. Hanson et al also disclose in providing a user with request. See fig 13, item 1110, col 3, lines 13-15. However, Hanson et al fail to disclose in forms a plurality of survey sections and the secondary set of questions relate to a businsess' products and customer's psychographic traits. Official notice is taken that forms a plurality of survey sections and the secondary set of questions relate to a businsess' products and customer's psychographic traits is old and well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to include forms a plurality of survey sections and the secondary set of questions relate to a businsess' products and customer's psychographic traits because this would improve Hanson's system to provide the customers with survey questions related to a businsess' products.

As per claim 5, Hanson et al disclose in an on line interaction. See the abstract, fig 3, items 318, fig 4, fig 5. Hanson et al also disclose in providing a user with request. See fig 13, item 1110, col 3, lines 13-15. However, Hanson et al fail to disclose in chosen based on the customer's response to the previous customer question and on a business identification number. Official notice is taken that chosen based on the customer's response to the previous customer question and on a business identification number is old and well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to include chosen based on the customer's response to the previous customer question and on a business identification number because this would improve Hanson's system to identify the customer number or information in a very easy way.

As per claim 6, Hanson et al disclose in an on line interaction. See the abstract, fig 3, items 318, fig 4, fig 5. Hanson et al also disclose in providing a user with request. See fig 13, item 1110, col 3, lines 13-15. However, Hanson et al fail to disclose in feed back page is generated based on the customer's responses to the customers questions. Powers discloses in feed back page is generated based on the customer's responses to the customers Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to include feed back page is generated based on the customer's responses to the customers questions because this would improve Hanson's system to generate a feedback page.

As per claim 11, Hanson et al disclose in providing a business with complied customer profile information where the customer is identified as a particular existing customer of the business. See the abstract, fig 1, item 102.

As per claim 12, Hanson et al disclose in an on line interaction. See the abstract, fig 3, items 318, fig 4, fig 5. Hanson et al also disclose in providing a user with request. See fig 13, item 1110, col 3, lines 13-15. However, Hanson et al fail to disclose in providing percentage completion and date information to the customer based on the percentage of the customer questions that have been answered by the customer and the date of the most recent visit to the survey by the customer. Official notice is taken that providing percentage completion and date information to the customer based on the percentage of the customer questions that have been answered by the customer and the date of the most recent visit to the survey by the customer is old and well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of

applicant's invention to include providing percentage completion and date information to the customer based on the percentage of the customer questions that have been answered by the customer and the date of the most recent visit to the survey by the customer because this would improve Hanson's system to provide an accurate survey processes.

As per claim 13, Hanson et al disclose in providing to the user a reward corresponding to the selected bid value, in response to the user having selected the advertiser. See col 15, lines 62-64. However, he specifically fails to disclose in providing goal planners to the customer. Official notice is taken that providing goal planners to the customer is old and well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to include providing goal planners to the customer because this would improve Hanson's system to achieve customers plan effectively.

As per claim 14, Hanson et al disclose in providing to the user a reward corresponding to the selected bid value, in response to the user having selected the advertiser. See col 15, lines 62-64. However, he specifically fails to disclose in graphics associated with the output of the goal planners and wherein the output graphics change in real time in response to changes in the input to the goal planners. Official notice is taken that graphics associated with the output of the goal planners and wherein the output graphics change in real time in response to changes in the input to the goal planners is old and well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to include graphics associated with the output of the goal planners and wherein the output graphics change in real time in response to

changes in the input to the goal planners because this would improve Hanson's system to achieve customers plan in graphics method.

3. Claims 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanson et al, 5974398 in view of Powers, 5956691 as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Personalogic.

As per claim 7, Hanson et al disclose in an on line interaction. See the abstract, fig 3, items 318, fig 4, fig 5. Hanson et al also disclose in providing a user with request. See fig 13, item 1110, col 3, lines 13-15. However, Hanson et al fail to disclose in graphics illustrative of and associated with at least some of the answers. Personalogic discloses in graphics illustrative of and associated with at least some of the answers. See PP 1-3. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the time the invention was made to modify the system of Hanson such that it will have graphic illustration. This is because it would improve Hanson's system to have graphic integrity.

As per claim 8, Hanson et al disclose in an on line interaction. See the abstract, fig 3, items 318, fig 4, fig 5. Hanson et al also disclose in providing a user with request. See fig 13, item 1110, col 3, lines 13-15. However, Hanson et al fail to disclose in an opportunity to gain pertinent information related to and apply for or purchase products or services. Personalogic discloses in an opportunity to gain pertinent information related to and apply for or purchase products or services. See PP 1-3. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the

time the invention was made to modify the system of Hanson such that it will have detailed information. This is because it would improve Hanson's system to have information related to and apply for or purchase products or services.

As per claim 9, Hanson et al disclose in an on line interaction. See the abstract, fig 3, items 318, fig 4, fig 5. Hanson et al also disclose in providing a user with request. See fig 13, item 1110, col 3, lines 13-15. However, Hanson et al fail to disclose in sending a message to a business offering the products or services regarding the application or requests for the products or services. Personalogic discloses in sending a message to a business offering the products or services regarding the application or requests for the products or services. See PP 1-3. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the time the invention was made to modify the system of Hanson such that it will have the ability to send a message to a business offering the products or services regarding the application or requests for the products or services. This is because it would improve Hanson's system to have a better business offerings of products and services for the customers.

4. Claims 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanson et al, 5974398.

As per claim 15, Hanson et al disclose in an on line interaction. See the abstract, fig 3, items 318, fig 4, fig 5. Hanson et al also disclose in providing a user with request. See fig 13, item 1110, col 3, lines 13-15. Hanson et al also disclose in customer profile database. See col 4, lines 14, 24-34.

Hanson et al also disclose in providing the customer with options to adjust the customer's actual demographic information. See fig 2, col 5, lines 63-67. However, Hanson et al fail to disclose in a survey system with customer questions, provide a feedback page, provide what-if options receive hypothetical demographic changes, and display hypothetical feedback information. Powers discloses in survey system with customer questions, provide a feedback page, provide what-if options receive hypothetical demographic changes, and display hypothetical feedback information. See the abstract, fig 1, and fig 3. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to include survey system with customer questions, provide a feedback page, provide what-if options receive hypothetical demographic changes, and display hypothetical feedback information because this would improve Hanson's system to have a feedback integrity.

As per claim 16, Hanson et al disclose in an on line interaction. See the abstract, fig 3, items 318, fig 4, fig 5. Hanson et al also disclose in providing a user with request. See fig 13, item 1110, col 3, lines 13-15. However, Hanson et al fail to disclose in chosen based on the customer's response to the previous customer question and on a business identification number. Official notice is taken that chosen based on the customer's response to the previous customer question and on a business identification number is old and well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to include chosen based on the customer's response to the previous customer question and on a business

identification number because this would improve Hanson's system to identify the customer number or information in a very easy way.

As per claim 17, Hanson et al disclose in an on line interaction. See the abstract, fig 3, items 318, fig 4, fig 5. Hanson et al also disclose in providing a user with request. See fig 13, item 1110, col 3, lines 13-15. However, Hanson et al fail to disclose in feed back page is generated based on the customer's responses to the customers questions. Official notice is taken that in feed back page is generated based on the customer's responses to the customers questions is old and well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to include feed back page is generated based on the customer's responses to the customers questions because this would improve Hanson's system to generate a feedback page.

As per claim 21, Hanson et al disclose in an on line interaction. See the abstract, fig 3, items 318, fig 4, fig 5. Hanson et al also disclose in providing a user with request. See fig 13, item 1110, col 3, lines 13-15. However, Hanson et al fail to disclose in providing percentage completion and date information to the customer based on the percentage of the customer questions that have been answered by the customer and the date of the most recent visit to the survey by the customer. Official notice is taken that providing percentage completion and date information to the customer based on the percentage of the customer questions that have been answered by the customer and the date of the most recent visit to the survey by the customer is old and well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of

applicant's invention to include providing percentage completion and date information to the customer based on the percentage of the customer questions that have been answered by the customer and the date of the most recent visit to the survey by the customer because this would improve Hanson's system to provide an accurate survey processes.

As per claim 22, Hanson et al disclose in an on line interaction. See the abstract, fig 3, items 318, fig 4, fig 5. Hanson et al also disclose in providing a user with request. See fig 13, item 1110, col 3, lines 13-15. However, Hanson et al fail to disclose in generating data sets for display based on data accessed in at least one table and wherein data accessed by the survey system is associated with a specific business or customer. Official notice is taken that generating data sets for display based on data accessed in at least one table and wherein data accessed by the survey system is associated with a specific business or customer is old and well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to include generating data sets for display based on data accessed in at least one table and wherein data accessed by the survey system is associated with a specific business or customer because this would improve Hanson's system to access the survey system of a specific business or customer.

5. Claims 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanson et al, 5974398 as applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of Personalogic.

As per claim 18, Hanson et al disclose in an on line interaction. See the abstract, fig 3, items 318, fig 4, fig 5. Hanson et al also disclose in providing a user with request. See fig 13, item 1110, col

3, lines 13-15. However, Hanson et al fail to disclose in an opportunity to gain pertinent information related to and apply for or purchase products or services. Personalogic discloses in an opportunity to gain pertinent information related to and apply for or purchase products or services. See PP 1-3. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the time the invention was made to modify the system of Hanson such that it will have detailed information. This is because it would improve Hanson's system to have information related to and apply for or purchase products or services.

As per claim 19, Hanson et al disclose in an on line interaction. See the abstract, fig 3, items 318, fig 4, fig 5. Hanson et al also disclose in providing a user with request. See fig 13, item 1110, col 3, lines 13-15. However, Hanson et al fail to disclose in sending a message to a business offering the products or services regarding the application or requests for the products or services. Personalogic discloses in sending a message to a business offering the products or services regarding the application or requests for the products or services. See PP 1-3. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the time the invention was made to modify the system of Hanson such that it will have the ability to send a message to a business offering the products or services regarding the application or requests for the products or services. This is because it would improve Hanson's system to have a better business offerings of products and services for the customers.

6. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanson et al, 5974398.

As per claim 23, Hanson et al disclose in Hanson et al disclose in an on line interaction. See the abstract, fig 3, items 318, fig 4, fig 5. Hanson et al also disclose in providing a user with request. See fig 13, item 1110, col 3, lines 13-15. Hanson et al also disclose in customer profile database. See col 4, lines 14, 24-34. Hanson et al also disclose in providing the customer with options to adjust the customer's actual demographic information. See fig 2, col 5, lines 63-67. However, Hanson et al fail to disclose in a survey system operable to supply the business data processing system with targeted marketing reports. Official notice is taken that a survey system operable to supply the business data processing system with targeted marketing reports is old and well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's to include a survey system operable to supply the business data processing system with targeted marketing reports because this would improve Hanson's system to have market integrity.

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 10, 20, 24 and 25 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Mussie Tesfamariam** whose telephone number is **(703)305-1393**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the **examiner's supervisor, Jim Trammell** can be reached at **(703) 305-9768**.

Any response to this office action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or **faxed to:**

(703)308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

(703)308-5357, (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to **Crystal park II, 2121 Crystal Drive Arlington, Virginia, (Receptionist).**

Mussie Tesfamariam

November 19, 1999

James P. Trammell
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2700